

claim 11. The dependency of the claims all, ultimately, from claim 1, makes clear that all the claims require the particulars of claim 1. That claims 14-16 also require other elements, such as polarizer elements, does not change the fact that it still requires the polymer defined by the other claims. That claims 14-16 require other elements is what makes them "combination" claims; it does not make them patentably distinct under M.P.E.P. § 806.05(c). For this reason, at least, the restriction should be withdrawn.

Additionally, applicants see no basis on the record for the allegation that the compounds of claims 1-10, compositions of claim 11 or polymers of claims 12-13 find another use as an adhesive or cosmetic. For this additional reason, the restriction should be withdrawn.

As to the restriction amongst claims 1-10, claim 11 and claims 12-13, Applicants again urge that there is no basis for the allegation that the compounds or compositions find another use as an adhesive or cosmetic. There is simply no evidence of record to suggest such additional use. It is also clear that the inventions are closely connected given the claim dependency and fact that the polymers and compositions require use of the compounds of claims 1-10.

For all of the above reasons, it is urged that the restriction requirement should be withdrawn in whole.

The new Office Action also makes an election of species requirement that was not made in the initial Office Action. Applicants also traverse this requirement on the grounds that it should have been made in the initial Office Action and on the grounds that no basis is provided in the Office Action of a burden of search justifying the requirement.

However, due to the requirement, applicants will elect the species of compounds and polymers shown in Example 1 with the above traversal. The examiner is, however, encouraged to examine the broadest possible scope of invention indicated by the elected species.